



2008 Maryland Nursing Facility Family Survey

Statewide Report

March 2009

Maryland Health Care Commission
4160 Patterson Avenue
Baltimore, Maryland 21215

Market Decisions, LLC
75 Washington Avenue, Suite 206
Portland, Maine 04101



Marilyn Moon, Ph.D., Chair

Vice President and Director, Health Program
American Institutes for Research

Gail R. Wilensky, Ph.D.
Vice Chair
Senior Fellow, Project Hope

Reverend Robert L. Conway
Retired Principal and Teacher
Calvert County Public School System

Garret A. Falcone
Executive Director
Charlestown Retirement Community

Tekedra McGee Jefferson, Esquire
Assistant General Counsel
AOL LLC

Sharon Krumm, R.N., Ph.D.
Administrator & Director of Nursing
The Sidney Kimmel Cancer Center
Johns Hopkins Hospital

Jeffrey D. Lucht, FSA, MAA
Aetna Health Inc.

Barbara Gill McLean, M.A.
Retired, Senior Policy Fellow
University of Maryland School of Medicine

Roscoe M. Moore, Jr., D.V.M., Ph.D., D.Sc.
Retired, U.S. Department of Health
and Human Services

Kurt B. Olsen, Esquire
Klafter and Olsen LLP

Sylvia Ontaneda-Bernales, Esquire
Ober, Kaler, Grimes & Shriver

Darren W. Petty
Vice President
Maryland State and DC AFL-CIO
General Motors/United Auto Workers

Andrew N. Pollak, M.D.
Associate Professor, Orthopedics
University of MD School of Medicine

Nevins W. Todd, Jr., M.D.
Cardiothoracic and General Surgery
Peninsula Regional Medical Center

Randall P. Worthington
President/Owner
York Insurance Services, Inc.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction0

II. How the Survey was Conducted.....1

III. The Sample1

IV. The Survey1

V. Glossary of Terms Used in This Report.....2

VI. Reading and Interpreting Scores3

VII. Domain Scores.....4

VIII. Overall Satisfaction Scores.....12

IX. Item Level Scores16

I. Introduction

In 2005, the Maryland Health Care Commission (MHCC) conducted a pilot family satisfaction survey as part of a multi-year process intended to measure the experience and satisfaction of family members and other designated responsible parties of residents in Maryland's long-term care facilities. Specific goals of this project have been to provide: 1) measures of responsible party experience and satisfaction; 2) comparisons on experience and satisfaction measures between nursing homes in Maryland; and 3) comparisons between nursing home peer groups, including those in the same geographic region, nursing homes of similar size, and for-profit and non-profit status of nursing homes. Only aggregate statewide results were published as a result of the pilot.

In 2007, MHCC conducted a second administration of the family satisfaction survey. While the goals and methodology remained the same, the questionnaire was revised based on feedback gathered during the pilot study. Results from the 2007 study were provided statewide as well as for each facility that participated. The third administration of the survey has been conducted in 2008 using a survey instrument similar to that of the 2007 study.

While a number of published performance measures are available, these tend to evaluate nursing homes from a regulatory standpoint. The most notable tools are the Maryland Nursing Home Guide, which can be found on the MHCC website and the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Nursing Home Compare website. The survey results complement these other measures by asking the designated responsible parties about their experience and satisfaction and providing a reliable set of measures based on their own personal experiences. The Maryland Health Care Commission posts individual nursing home data on the website to allow consumers to compare one nursing home to another. The survey represents another addition to the MHCC's transparency initiative.

This report presents results for the 2008 survey and includes data for each item measured. Facility specific results will, as in 2007, be posted on the MHCC website to assist consumers in making informed choices about nursing home selection. Trending results are also included in the 2008 reports, comparing state and facility results to those in the 2007 survey.

Participating nursing homes with a sufficient response rate receive a customized report that presents results specific to that facility, enabling comparisons to statewide and peer averages. These customized reports can serve as a management tool by identifying areas where a nursing home excels or areas where improvement is needed.

Highlights of the 2008 results show that:

- The statewide average score for the overall care received was 8.2 out of 10. In 2007, the statewide score for overall care was also 8.2.
- For the state, 89% of all respondents indicated they would recommend the nursing home. The comparable number in 2007 was 88%.

The highest-ranking domain is "Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home" which received an average statewide score of 3.6 out of 4. The lowest ranking is "Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home" with a statewide average of 3.4. While overall satisfaction scores are high among all peer groups, there are differences in satisfaction among peer groups by bed size, region, and ownership type. Homes with 80 licensed beds or less had the highest overall satisfaction score (8.8), followed by non-profit homes

(8.6) and homes in the Western Region of the state (8.6). The lowest overall satisfaction scores were found among homes in the Central (8.0) region and for-profit homes (8.0).

II. How the Survey was Conducted

All nursing homes in Maryland that had one or more residents with stays of 90 days or longer were included in the survey. The facilities provided a list of designated responsible parties for each resident who was currently residing in the nursing facility. A responsible party is most often a family member, a spouse or a child, but also can be non-relative such as a friend. It is important to remember responsible parties of residents with a stay less than 90 days were not asked to participate in the survey, therefore, the experience and satisfaction of the responsible parties of people who need short-term skilled nursing care or rehabilitation following an acute hospital stay are not captured by the results of this survey. There were several nursing homes in Maryland that had only short stay residents, therefore, those facilities were not included in the survey.

A survey packet consisting of a letter requesting participation in the survey and the questionnaire was sent to each designated responsible party whose resident(s) met the eligibility criteria. One week after this initial mailing, a follow up reminder postcard was sent and a second survey packet was mailed to those who did not respond initially. Follow-up telephone calls were also made to increase response rates.

III. The Sample

A total of 223 nursing homes throughout Maryland participated in this 2008 survey. In all, surveys were mailed to 17,057 responsible parties. The initial mailing was sent on September 12th, 2008. All surveys received through January 13th, 2009 were accepted and included for analysis. A total of 9,645 eligible respondents returned a survey by this date. The overall response rate for all facilities was 59%.

In 2007, 224 nursing homes throughout Maryland participated. Surveys were mailed to 17,113 responsible parties and 9,575 were returned, resulting in an overall response rate of 58%. The overall response rate for the pilot study in 2005 was 55%.

The response rate is the total number of surveys returned by eligible respondents divided by the number of respondents to whom surveys were mailed minus those returned as undeliverable by the post office.

IV. The Survey

Designated responsible parties completed a survey about their experience and satisfaction with the facility and the care provided to residents. The 2008 survey contained 25 items which assessed five domains or aspects of residents' life and care:

- Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home
- Care Provided to Residents
- Food and Meals
- Autonomy & Resident Rights
- Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home

Within each domain, respondents rated different aspects of residents' life and care. Respondents also rated two items measuring overall impressions of the facility.

There were some differences between the 2007 and 2008 survey. The 2007 survey contained 58 items across seven domains. While the 2007 survey was also designed to measure a responsible party's overall experience and satisfaction with the nursing facility, the decision was made in 2008 to simplify the survey instrument with the goal of reducing respondent burden and improving survey response rates. Therefore, a number of questions and two domains were dropped in 2008. The two domains that were removed from the most recent questionnaire include:

- Quality and Variety of Food
- Activities Available to Residents

Aspects of these domains were incorporated into other parts of the survey.

V. Glossary of Terms Used in This Report

Domains

The 2008 Maryland Nursing Facility Family Survey contained 25 items designed to measure a responsible party's overall experience and satisfaction with the nursing facility as well as within specific areas of supporting services and the environment. These areas, or domains, include:

1. Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home
2. Care Provided to Residents
3. Food and Meals
4. Autonomy & Resident Rights
5. Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home

Peer Groups

For the purpose of making comparisons, facilities were divided into three peer groups: (1) facilities in the same geographic region; (2) facilities of similar licensed bed size; and (3) for-profit/non-profit facilities. Peer groups and statewide averages provide benchmarks by which you can compare facility results to those of other similar facilities. Results for all peer groups are presented in the charts and tables.

Region of the State

Locations for peer group comparisons are based upon counties within Maryland. The regions are listed below and include:

Western Maryland: Allegany, Carroll, Frederick, Garrett, and Washington Counties

Montgomery: Montgomery County

Southern Maryland: Calvert, Charles, Prince George's, and St. Mary's Counties

Central Maryland: Baltimore City; Anne Arundel, Baltimore, Harford, and Howard Counties

Eastern Shore: Caroline, Cecil, Dorchester, Kent, Queen Anne's, Somerset, Talbot, Wicomico, and Worcester Counties

Size

Nursing home size categories were calculated from licensed bed size counts. There are four size categories: 1) eighty or fewer beds, 2) 81-120 beds, 3) 121-160 beds, and 4) more than 160 beds.

Ownership Type

Nursing homes were categorized as for-profit or non-profit ownership types to allow for peer group comparisons.

Payment Source

Source of payment for residents has been classified into Medicaid and Other.

VI. Reading and Interpreting Scores

- Domain Scores start on page 5
- Overall Satisfaction Scores start on page 12

This report contains tables and charts that display average scores¹ for the five domains and two overall measures. Each domain contains a bar chart and table that displays the statewide score along with peer groups. These tables and charts are discussed in more detail below.

The domain scores in this report are averages on a scale of 1 to 4, while one of the overall scores is an average on a scale of 1 to 10. Because the averages provided in this report are estimates of the actual averages, scores are best interpreted not as single points but as ranges. They are considered estimates because they are based on the information provided by survey respondents rather than all family members. Determination of an actual average would require surveying the entire population of responsible parties, which is not practical. For this reason, the tables show an average score and then a 95% confidence interval (CI) with statistically significant differences noted.²

Domain Scores

As stated above, the survey questions were grouped into five domains, or aspects of residents' life and care. These domains include:

- Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home
- Care Provided to Residents
- Food and Meals
- Autonomy & Resident Rights
- Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home

The domain scores are calculated by averaging the scores on the four-point scale (where 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Usually, and 4=Always) across all valid items, or questions, within that domain. This resulted in an average domain score that ranged from 1 to 4.

¹ For simplicity, the word "average" actually refers to a weighted average. A weighted average was used in determining average item and domain scores. The number of respondents who answered an item, or all relevant items in the case of a domain, was adjusted statistically to ensure that all groups of responsible parties are fairly represented in the results. All item and domain scores are presented in this report as a weighted average.

² You will see the term "statistical difference" used throughout the report. The term refers to those differences that are statistically different at 95% confidence, even if the word "statistically" is not present.

A low domain score indicates a low level of experience and satisfaction within a particular aspect of care and life, such as physical aspects of the nursing home, while a high score indicates a high level of experience and satisfaction. For example, a domain with a low score relative to other peer groups or other domains may identify an opportunity for quality improvement.

Figure 1.1 shows all the domain scores for the state so that the five domains can be directly compared. Figures 1.2 – 1.6 display the statewide and peer group scores for each domain. These figures provide the statewide average score and average score for peer groups based on their geographic location, size, ownership type, and payment source.

The tables in this report were designed so that you can see the average scores with their upper and lower confidence intervals. A difference between domains or overall satisfaction items or across groups is considered statistically significant **if** there is no overlap in the confidence intervals. To assist with this interpretation, the tables in this report have a column labeled “Significant Difference” that will contain an up (↑) or down arrow (↓) if significant differences exist (at 95% confidence).

If a peer group score is significantly higher than the state, an up arrow (↑) will appear in the “Significant Difference” column (of the peer group row). A down arrow (↓) means that the peer group score is significantly lower than the state. A blank in the column indicates no statistically significant difference between scores.

As noted before, the 95% confidence interval assures that differences in scores between the state and peer groups can be accurately noted. When comparing items, domains, or groups of facilities, it is important to take into account the confidence interval and not simply the average to determine if a difference exists. Remember that averages are technically only the calculated midpoint in a statistical distribution and the confidence interval provides a better estimate of a particular score.

VII. Domain Scores

The following charts and tables compare average domain scores for the state and peer groups. Note that comparison of overall satisfaction scores is presented in Section VIII, beginning on page 12.

- Figure 1.1 Summary of Statewide Domain Scores
- Figure 1.2 Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home
- Figure 1.3 Care Provided to Residents
- Figure 1.4 Food and Meals
- Figure 1.5 Autonomy & Resident Rights
- Figure 1.6 Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home

Figure 1.1. Statewide Domain Scores




Table 1.1. Statewide Domain Scores

	2007			2008			Significant Difference
	Average	CI Low	CI High	Average	CI Low	CI High	
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.7	↑
Care Provided to Residents	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Food and Meals	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Autonomy & Resident Rights	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.5	↑
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	↑

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the 2008 statewide score is statistically significantly higher than the score in 2007, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the 2008 score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 1.2. 2008 Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home Domain Scores by Peer Group




Table 1.2. 2008 Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home Domain Scores by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	9,244	3.6	3.6	3.7	
Region					
Western	2,014	3.8	3.7	3.8	
Montgomery	1,517	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Southern	1,235	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Central	3,474	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Eastern	1,004	3.7	3.7	3.7	
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,189	3.8	3.7	3.8	
81-120 Beds	2,216	3.6	3.6	3.7	
121-160 Beds	2,773	3.6	3.6	3.6	
161+ Beds	3,066	3.6	3.6	3.7	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	4,117	3.7	3.7	3.7	
For-profit	5,127	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Payment Source					
Medicaid	6,241	3.6	3.6	3.6	
Other	3,003	3.7	3.6	3.7	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 1.3. 2008 Care Provided to Residents Domain Scores by Peer Group




Table 1.3. 2008 Care Provided to Residents Domain Scores by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	9,169	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Region					
Western	2,010	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
Montgomery	1,499	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Southern	1,224	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Central	3,453	3.4	3.4	3.4	
Eastern	983	3.5	3.5	3.6	
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,170	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
81-120 Beds	2,196	3.4	3.4	3.5	
121-160 Beds	2,768	3.4	3.4	3.5	
161+ Beds	3,035	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	4,076	3.5	3.5	3.6	
For-profit	5,093	3.4	3.4	3.4	
Payment Source					
Medicaid	6,182	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Other	2,987	3.5	3.5	3.5	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 1.4. 2008 Food and Meals Domain Scores by Peer Group




Table 1.4. 2008 Food and Meals Domain Scores by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	6,578	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Region					
Western	1,518	3.6	3.5	3.6	
Montgomery	990	3.5	3.5	3.6	
Southern	918	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Central	2,421	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Eastern	731	3.5	3.5	3.6	
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	774	3.7	3.6	3.7	↑
81-120 Beds	1,609	3.5	3.4	3.5	
121-160 Beds	2,029	3.4	3.4	3.5	
161+ Beds	2,166	3.5	3.5	3.6	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	2,935	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
For-profit	3,643	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Payment Source					
Medicaid	4,473	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Other	2,105	3.5	3.5	3.5	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 1.5. 2008 Autonomy & Resident Rights Domain Scores by Peer Group




Table 1.5. 2008 Autonomy & Resident Rights Domain Scores by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	8,357	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Region					
Western	1,850	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
Montgomery	1,330	3.6	3.5	3.6	
Southern	1,123	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Central	3,135	3.4	3.4	3.4	↓
Eastern	919	3.5	3.5	3.5	
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,090	3.7	3.6	3.7	↑
81-120 Beds	1,993	3.5	3.4	3.5	
121-160 Beds	2,515	3.4	3.4	3.5	
161+ Beds	2,759	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	3,782	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
For-profit	4,575	3.4	3.4	3.4	↓
Payment Source					
Medicaid	5,631	3.4	3.4	3.4	↓
Other	2,726	3.6	3.5	3.6	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 1.6. 2008 Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home Domain Scores by Peer Group




Figure 1.6. 2008 Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home Domain Scores by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	8,970	3.4	3.4	3.4	
Region					
Western	1,967	3.5	3.4	3.5	
Montgomery	1,460	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Southern	1,202	3.3	3.3	3.4	
Central	3,370	3.3	3.3	3.3	↓
Eastern	971	3.4	3.4	3.5	
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,152	3.6	3.6	3.6	↑
81-120 Beds	2,155	3.4	3.3	3.4	
121-160 Beds	2,699	3.3	3.3	3.3	↓
161+ Beds	2,964	3.3	3.3	3.4	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	4,017	3.5	3.5	3.5	↑
For-profit	4,953	3.3	3.3	3.3	↓
Payment Source					
Medicaid	6,031	3.3	3.3	3.4	
Other	2,939	3.4	3.4	3.4	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

VIII. Overall Satisfaction Scores

Two questions were included in the survey to assess a responsible party's overall satisfaction with the facility. The overall satisfaction scores were calculated by adding up all the responses for a question and dividing by the total number of responses. This resulted in scores that ranged from 1 to 10. Figure 2.2 displays the satisfaction scores on the question of overall rating of care received.

One overall item score (Figure 2.3) is the percentage of respondents responding "Definitely Yes" and "Probably Yes" to whether they would recommend the nursing home. It is calculated by adding up all weighted scores and dividing by the total number of responses.

As with the individual domains, a figure and table is presented comparing the statewide score with the peer group scores. Differences are noted in Tables 2.1 to 2.3 with an up (↑) or down arrow (↓) to identify when a peer group score is significantly higher (↑) or lower (↓) than the state.

Figures 2.1 through 2.3 show overall satisfaction scores for your facility compared to the entire state and peer groups.

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Figure 2.1 | Overall Satisfaction Scores (2007 vs. 2008) |
| Figure 2.2 | Overall rating of care received at the nursing home |
| Figure 2.3 | Would you recommend this nursing home? |

Figure 2.1. Overall Satisfaction Scores (2007 vs. 2008)




Table 2.1. Overall Satisfaction Scores (2007 vs. 2008)

	2007			2008			Significant Difference
	Average	CI Low	CI High	Average	CI Low	CI High	
Overall rating of care received at the nursing home	8.2	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.2	
If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them? (Percent "Definitely Yes" and "Probably Yes")	88%	88%	89%	89%	88%	89%	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the 2008 statewide score is statistically significantly higher than the score in 2007, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the 2008 score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 2.2. 2008 Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home by Peer Group




Table 2.2. 2008 Overall Rating of Care Received at the Nursing Home by Peer Group

	n	Average	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	9,356	8.2	8.2	8.2	
Region					
Western	2,026	8.6	8.6	8.7	↑
Montgomery	1,533	8.4	8.3	8.4	↑
Southern	1,259	8.1	8.0	8.2	
Central	3,525	8.0	8.0	8.1	↓
Eastern	1,013	8.4	8.3	8.5	↑
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,195	8.8	8.8	8.9	↑
81-120 Beds	2,236	8.1	8.1	8.2	
121-160 Beds	2,825	8.1	8.0	8.1	↓
161+ Beds	3,100	8.2	8.2	8.3	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	4,155	8.6	8.6	8.7	↑
For-profit	5,201	8.0	7.9	8.0	↓
Payment Source					
Medicaid	6,328	8.2	8.1	8.2	
Other	3,028	8.3	8.2	8.4	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

Figure 2.3. If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them? (Percent of those responding “Definitely Yes” and “Probably Yes” by Peer Group) - 2008




Table 2.3. If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them? (Percent of those responding “Definitely Yes” and “Probably Yes” by Peer Group) - 2008

	n	% Yes	CI		Significant Difference
			Low	High	
Statewide	8,435	89%	88%	89%	
Region					
Western	1,889	93%	92%	94%	↑
Montgomery	1,416	91%	90%	93%	↑
Southern	1,117	88%	87%	90%	
Central	3,086	86%	84%	87%	↓
Eastern	927	91%	90%	93%	↑
Size					
≤ 80 Beds	1,130	95%	94%	95%	↑
81-120 Beds	2,020	88%	86%	89%	
121-160 Beds	2,493	87%	86%	88%	
161+ Beds	2,792	89%	88%	90%	
Ownership Type					
Non-profit	3,905	94%	93%	94%	↑
For-profit	4,530	86%	85%	87%	↓
Payment Source					
Medicaid	5,676	88%	87%	89%	
Other	2,759	89%	88%	90%	

An up arrow (↑) indicates that the peer group has a significantly higher average score than the state, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference.

IX. Item Level Scores

This section provides a summary of each of the items that are used in calculating the five domain scores. Questions were evaluated using either a 4-point scale (1 meaning “Never” to 4 meaning “Always”) or as Yes/No options.

In addition, there were two questions that evaluated the overall experience and level of care provided by the nursing home. Item scores were calculated by averaging responses for each question across all respondents, resulting in a score ranging from 1 to 4 (1 to 10 for the overall measure) or, in the case of Yes/No questions, the percentage of those responding “Yes” or “No.” Responsible parties who indicated they did not know, were unsure, or that an item was not applicable were not included in these calculations.

The table below classifies the survey items by the different areas of life and care. The scores listed under the header “2008” represent the scores for all respondents in the state. The peer group headings reflect the regions in which facilities are located (Western, Montgomery, Southern, Central, Eastern), the size group based on the number of licensed beds (<=80, 81-120, 121-160, 161+), the ownership type of the facility (for-profit/non-profit), and the resident payment source (Medicaid/Other).

Next to the score for peer groups is a column labeled “Diff,” which provides comparisons between peer group scores and the statewide score. As with the domain and overall satisfaction measures, differences in the item level scores are noted with an up arrow (↑) when a peer group average is significantly higher (at 95% confidence) than the state, or a down arrow (↓) when it is significantly lower.

Low scoring items indicate a low level of satisfaction and experience and high scores indicate a high level of satisfaction and experience³. These items can help identify specific personal care categories or attributes that need further evaluation. Specific items can also help identify aspects of domain areas that received lower scores.

Please note that questions in italics are ones that were used in the domain calculation.

³ For the majority of the scale items, 4 (meaning Always) is a positive response. For example, question 12 reads “...how often were you involved as much as you wanted in care decisions?” However, questions 14 and 24 use a reverse 4-point scale where Always is a negative response. To maintain consistency of results, the scale for these two questions has been reversed in the results so that 1=Always and 4=Never and, like the other items, high average scores still represent high levels of experience and satisfaction.

Table A. Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Region

Questions	State Score	Region									
		Western		Montgomery		Southern		Central		Eastern	
		Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Satisfaction with Overall Experience											
30. Using any number from 1 to 10, where 10 is the best care possible and 1 is the worst care possible, what number would you use to rate the care at this nursing home?	8.2	8.6	↑	8.4	↑	8.1	↓	8.0	↓	8.4	↑
31. If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them?	89%	93%	↑	91%	↑	88%		86%	↓	91%	↑
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home											
7. In the last 6 months, if you asked for information about the resident, how often did you get the information within 48 hours?	3.5	3.6	↑	3.5		3.4	↓	3.5	↓	3.6	↑
8. In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>you</u> with courtesy and respect?	3.7	3.8	↑	3.6		3.6		3.7		3.7	
9. In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>the resident</u> with courtesy and respect?	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5		3.5		3.5		3.6	↑
10. In the last 6 months, did the nurses or nursing assistants ever discourage you from asking questions about the resident? (% Responding "No")	95%	97%	↑	95%		94%	↓	95%		96%	
Food and Meals											
24. How often did you help with eating or drinking because the nurses or nursing assistants were not available to help or made him or her wait too long?*	3.5	3.6	↑	3.5		3.5		3.5		3.5	
Autonomy & Resident Rights											
25. If the resident desires private space for visits such as with clergy or family, is private space provided?	3.4	3.6	↑	3.5	↑	3.3	↓	3.3	↓	3.5	
26. In the last 6 months, was the resident's or other residents' privacy protected when the resident was dressing, showering, bathing, or in a public area?	3.5	3.6	↑	3.6		3.5		3.5		3.6	
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home											
27. In the last 6 months, did the public areas of the nursing home look and smell clean?	3.4	3.6	↑	3.5	↑	3.4	↓	3.3	↓	3.5	↑
28. In the last 6 months, how often did the resident's room look and smell clean?	3.3	3.4	↑	3.4	↑	3.3		3.2	↓	3.4	↑
29. In the last 6 months, was the noise level around the resident's room acceptable to you?	3.4	3.4		3.4		3.4		3.3		3.4	↑

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference. Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations

*To maintain consistency of results, the scale for question 24 has been reversed in the results so that 1=Always and 4=Never and, like the other items, high average scores still represent high levels of experience and satisfaction.

Table A (Continued). Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Region

		Region									
	State	Western		Montgomery		Southern		Central		Eastern	
Questions	Score	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Care Provided to Residents											
11. Were you invited to participate in a care conference in the last 6 months? (% Responding "Yes")	91%	95%	↑	94%	↑	93%		88%	↓	93%	↑
12. In the last 6 months, how often were you involved as much as you wanted in care decisions?*	3.4	3.5	↑	3.4		3.3		3.3	↓	3.4	
13. In the last 6 months, during any of your visits, did you help the resident with toileting? (% Responding "Yes")	24%	21%	↓	23%		26%		25%		23%	
14. In the last 6 months, how often did you help with toileting because the nurses or nursing assistants were either not available or made him or her wait too long?	3.0	3.1		3.0		3.0		3.0		3.1	
15. In the last 6 months, did the resident look and smell clean?	3.3	3.5	↑	3.4	↑	3.3		3.3	↓	3.4	↑
16. In the last 6 months, did the resident use the nursing home's laundry service for his or her clothes? (% Responding "Yes")	64%	78%	↑	63%		60%	↓	59%	↓	63%	
17. In the last 6 months, how often were you satisfied with the laundry service the resident received?	3.2	3.4	↑	3.2		3.1		3.1	↓	3.3	↑
18. In the last 6 months, did you see any resident, including this resident, behave in a way that made it hard for nurses or nursing assistants to provide care? (% Responding "Yes")	29%	34%	↑	32%	↑	26%		27%		25%	↓
19. How often did nurses/nursing aides handle the situation in a way that was acceptable to you?	3.4	3.6	↑	3.4		3.3		3.4		3.6	↑
20. In the last 6 months, did you have issues or concerns with the care the resident received in the nursing home? (% Responding "No")	57%	63%	↑	57%		52%	↓	54%		63%	↑
21. In the last 6 months, did you discuss any issues or concerns with nursing home staff? (% Responding "Yes", among those with concerns with care resident receives)	97%	97%		98%		97%		96%		98%	
22. In the last 6 months, were you satisfied with the way the nursing home staff handled issues or concerns that you brought to their attention?	2.8	3.0	↑	2.9		2.8		2.8	↓	2.9	
23. In the last 6 months, did you ever stop yourself from talking to any nursing home staff about your concerns because you thought they might take it out on the resident? (% Responding "No")	89%	92%	↑	88%		87%		87%		91%	↑

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference. *Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations.*

*To maintain consistency of results, the scale for question 12 has been reversed in the results so that 1=Always and 4=Never and, like the other items, high average scores still represent high levels of experience and satisfaction.

Table A (Continued). Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Bed Size

	State	Bed Size							
		≤ 80 Beds		81-120 Beds		121-160 Beds		161+ Beds	
Questions	Score	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Satisfaction with Overall Experience									
30. Using any number from 1 to 10, where 10 is the best care possible and 1 is the worst care possible, what number would you use to rate the care at this nursing home?	8.2	8.8	↑	8.1		8.1	↓	8.2	
31. If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them?	89%	95%	↑	88%		87%		89%	
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home									
7. <i>In the last 6 months, if you asked for information about the resident, how often did you get the information within 48 hours?</i>	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5		3.5		3.5	
8. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>you</u> with courtesy and respect?</i>	3.7	3.8	↑	3.7		3.7		3.7	
9. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>the resident</u> with courtesy and respect?</i>	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5		3.5		3.5	
10. <i>In the last 6 months, did the nurses or nursing assistants ever discourage you from asking questions about the resident? (% Responding "No")</i>	95%	98%	↑	94%		95%		95%	
Food and Meals									
24. <i>How often did you help with eating or drinking because the nurses or nursing assistants were not available to help or made him or her wait too long?</i>	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5		3.4	↓	3.5	
Autonomy & Resident Rights									
25. <i>If the resident desires private space for visits such as with clergy or family, is private space provided?</i>	3.4	3.7	↑	3.4		3.3	↓	3.4	
26. <i>In the last 6 months, was the resident's or other residents' privacy protected when the resident was dressing, showering, bathing, or in a public area?</i>	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5		3.5		3.5	
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home									
27. <i>In the last 6 months, did the public areas of the nursing home look and smell clean?</i>	3.4	3.7	↑	3.4		3.4	↓	3.4	
28. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the resident's room look and smell clean?</i>	3.3	3.6	↑	3.3		3.2	↓	3.3	
29. <i>In the last 6 months, was the noise level around the resident's room acceptable to you?</i>	3.4	3.5	↑	3.4		3.3		3.4	

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference. *Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations.*

Table A (Continued). Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Bed Size

	State	Bed Size							
		≤ 80 Beds		81-120 Beds		121-160 Beds		161+ Beds	
Questions	Score	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Care Provided to Residents									
<i>11. Were you invited to participate in a care conference in the last 6 months? (% Responding "Yes")</i>	91%	91%		90%		93%		91%	
12. In the last 6 months, how often were you involved as much as you wanted in care decisions?	3.4	3.5	↑	3.4		3.3		3.4	
13. In the last 6 months, during any of your visits, did you help the resident with toileting? (% Responding "Yes")	24%	22%		25%		25%		23%	
<i>14. In the last 6 months, how often did you help with toileting because the nurses or nursing assistants were either not available or made him or her wait too long?</i>	3.0	3.2	↑	2.9		3.0		3.1	
<i>15. In the last 6 months, did the resident look and smell clean?</i>	3.3	3.5	↑	3.3		3.3	↓	3.3	
16. In the last 6 months, did the resident use the nursing home's laundry service for his or her clothes? (% Responding "Yes")	64%	71%	↑	64%		64%		60%	↓
<i>17. In the last 6 months, how often were you satisfied with the laundry service the resident received?</i>	3.2	3.4	↑	3.2		3.2		3.1	↓
18. In the last 6 months, did you see any resident, including this resident, behave in a way that made it hard for nurses or nursing assistants to provide care? (% Responding "Yes")	29%	33%	↑	27%		28%		30%	
<i>19. How often did nurses/nursing aides handle the situation in a way that was acceptable to you?</i>	3.4	3.6	↑	3.4		3.4		3.4	
20. In the last 6 months, did you have issues or concerns with the care the resident received in the nursing home? (% Responding "No")	57%	63%	↑	58%		54%		56%	
21. In the last 6 months, did you discuss any issues or concerns with nursing home staff? (% Responding "Yes", among those with concerns with care resident receives)	97%	99%		97%		97%		96%	
<i>22. In the last 6 months, were you satisfied with the way the nursing home staff handled issues or concerns that you brought to their attention?</i>	2.8	3.0	↑	2.8		2.8		2.8	
<i>23. In the last 6 months, did you ever stop yourself from talking to any nursing home staff about your concerns because you thought they might take it out on the resident? (% Responding "No")</i>	89%	92%	↑	89%		88%		88%	

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence).

Blank cells indicate no difference. *Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations.*

Table A (Continued). Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Ownership Type and Payment Source

	State	Ownership Type				Payment Source			
		Non-Profit		For-Profit		Medicaid		Other	
Questions	Score	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Satisfaction with Overall Experience									
30. Using any number from 1 to 10, where 10 is the best care possible and 1 is the worst care possible, what number would you use to rate the care at this nursing home?	8.2	8.6	↑	8.0	↓	8.2		8.3	↑
31. If someone needed nursing home care, would you recommend this nursing home to them?	89%	94%	↑	86%	↓	88%		89%	
Staff and Administration of the Nursing Home									
7. <i>In the last 6 months, if you asked for information about the resident, how often did you get the information within 48 hours?</i>	3.5	3.6	↑	3.4	↓	3.5		3.5	
8. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>you</u> with courtesy and respect?</i>	3.7	3.8	↑	3.6	↓	3.7		3.7	
9. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the nurses and nursing assistants treat <u>the resident</u> with courtesy and respect?</i>	3.5	3.6	↑	3.5	↓	3.5		3.5	
10. <i>In the last 6 months, did the nurses or nursing assistants ever discourage you from asking questions about the resident? (% Responding "No")</i>	95%	96%	↑	95%		95%		96%	
Food and Meals									
24. <i>How often did you help with eating or drinking because the nurses or nursing assistants were not available to help or made him or her wait too long?</i>	3.5	3.6	↑	3.4	↓	3.5		3.5	
Autonomy & Resident Rights									
25. <i>If the resident desires private space for visits such as with clergy or family, is private space provided?</i>	3.4	3.6	↑	3.3	↓	3.3	↓	3.5	↑
26. <i>In the last 6 months, was the resident's or other residents' privacy protected when the resident was dressing, showering, bathing, or in a public area?</i>	3.5	3.7	↑	3.5	↓	3.5		3.6	↑
Physical Aspects of the Nursing Home									
27. <i>In the last 6 months, did the public areas of the nursing home look and smell clean?</i>	3.4	3.6	↑	3.3	↓	3.4	↓	3.5	↑
28. <i>In the last 6 months, how often did the resident's room look and smell clean?</i>	3.3	3.5	↑	3.2	↓	3.3		3.3	↑
29. <i>In the last 6 months, was the noise level around the resident's room acceptable to you?</i>	3.4	3.4	↑	3.3	↓	3.4		3.4	

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence). Blank cells indicate no difference. *Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations.*

Table A (Continued). Statewide 2008 Item Level Scores by Ownership Type and Payment Source

Questions	State	Ownership Type				Payment Source			
		Non-Profit		For-Profit		Medicaid		Other	
	Score	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff	Score	Diff
Care Provided to Residents									
<i>11. Were you invited to participate in a care conference in the last 6 months? (% Responding "Yes")</i>	91%	94%	↑	90%		91%		92%	
12. In the last 6 months, how often were you involved as much as you wanted in care decisions?	3.4	3.5	↑	3.3	↓	3.3		3.4	↑
13. In the last 6 months, during any of your visits, did you help the resident with toileting? (% Responding "Yes")	24%	24%		24%		23.3%		25.6%	
<i>14. In the last 6 months, how often did you help with toileting because the nurses or nursing assistants were either not available or made him or her wait too long?</i>	3.0	3.1	↑	3.0		3.0		3.1	
<i>15. In the last 6 months, did the resident look and smell clean?</i>	3.3	3.4	↑	3.3	↓	3.3		3.4	↑
16. In the last 6 months, did the resident use the nursing home's laundry service for his or her clothes? (% Responding "Yes")	64%	67%	↑	61%	↓	64%		62%	
<i>17. In the last 6 months, how often were you satisfied with the laundry service the resident received?</i>	3.2	3.3	↑	3.1	↓	3.2		3.2	
18. In the last 6 months, did you see any resident, including this resident, behave in a way that made it hard for nurses or nursing assistants to provide care? (% Responding "Yes")	29%	31%	↑	27%		27%		33%	↑
<i>19. How often did nurses/nursing aides handle the situation in a way that was acceptable to you?</i>	3.4	3.5	↑	3.4		3.4		3.4	
20. In the last 6 months, did you have issues or concerns with the care the resident received in the nursing home? (% Responding "No")	57%	60%	↑	55%		58%		53%	↓
21. In the last 6 months, did you discuss any issues or concerns with nursing home staff? (% Responding "Yes", among those with concerns with care resident receives)	97%	98%		97%		96%		98%	
<i>22. In the last 6 months, were you satisfied with the way the nursing home staff handled issues or concerns that you brought to their attention?</i>	2.8	3.0	↑	2.8	↓	2.8		2.9	↑
<i>23. In the last 6 months, did you ever stop yourself from talking to any nursing home staff about your concerns because you thought they might take it out on the resident? (% Responding "No")</i>	89%	91%	↑	87%		89%		88%	

Under the Peer Group Header: An up arrow (↑) indicates that the average score for the peer group is significantly higher than the statewide score, a down arrow (↓) indicates that the peer group score is significantly lower (at 95% confidence).

Blank cells indicate no difference. Italicized questions are used in the domain score calculations.